



UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH LIBRARY



3 1188 01283919 3

*David Murray  
Glasgow*



UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH

00005591

## The Library

SOCSCI

DA 787.D37 F72

Fraser, William, Sir,

1816-1898

Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley

*81*

Privately printed by Sir William Fraser.

Edinburgh.  
1904.

Date due

95 08 10

95 03 08



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/henrystewartlord00fras>





# LENNOX SEALS

PLATE I.



1. Charter Seal of Malcolm, Fifth Earl of Lennox 1292.
2. Signet of Malcolm Fifth Earl of Lennox = 1292.
3. Seal of Ludovick Second Duke of Lennox 1586.







HENRY STEWART, LORD DARNLEY, LORD OF ARDMANACH,  
EARL OF ROSS, DUKE OF ALBANY, AND  
KING OF SCOTLAND, 1545-1567.

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS, 1542-1587.

THE history of this unfortunate son of the House of Lennox, which forms one of the saddest chapters in the history of Scotland, has been often told. Yet a mere reference to the story of his life as it is scattered through numerous historical works would not be sufficient in a work treating specially of the family of which he was so conspicuous a member. We have therefore given a full record of his life, deriving our materials from original accessible sources of information, and availing ourselves of the new facts concerning him which are disclosed in the papers now printed for the first time in the second volume of this book.

Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, the second born but eldest surviving son of Matthew, twelfth Earl of Lennox and Lady Margaret Douglas his Countess, was born on 7th December 1545 at Temple Newsome in England. He was brought up in England, and educated in the Roman Catholic faith. His principal tutor was John Elder, a priest, who was a member of the Collegiate Church of Dumbarton, founded, as has been already narrated, by Isabella Countess of Lennox and Duchess of Albany. Elder was noted for the

beauty of his penmanship, and young Darnley excelled in the same art. His mother took great pains to have him trained in fashionable accomplishments, causing him to be taught from his youth to play on the lute, to dance, and other honourable exercises.<sup>1</sup>

In 1554, when only in his ninth year, he wrote a letter to Queen Mary of England,<sup>2</sup> in which he says, "It haith pleased your moste excellente Maiestie laitlie to accepte a little plote of my simple penning, which I termed *Vtopia Noua* ; for the which it being base, vile, and maymed, your Maiestie haith gyven me a riche cheane of golde."<sup>3</sup> At so early an age it may be doubted whether Darnley did much more than simply copy both the letter and *Utopia Nova* which Elder had set before him. Elder, along with a letter (printed in 1555) which he wrote to Darnley's uncle, Lord Robert Stewart, Bishop of Caithness, sent some verses and adages written by Darnley, whom he praises as likely to prove "a witty, virtuous, and an active, well-learned gentleman."

Darnley is said to have afterwards translated Valerius Maximus into English.<sup>4</sup> A ballad of eight stanzas, entitled "The Complaint, an Epistle to his Mistress on the force of Luve," has been ascribed to him.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Memoires de Castelnau*, in Jebb, vol. ii. p. 462.

<sup>2</sup> The letter is dated from Temple Newsome, 28th March 1554.

<sup>3</sup> Original letter in the British Museum, photographed in the National Manuscripts of Scotland, Part iii., No. xxxvi.

<sup>4</sup> Bishop Montagu's Preface to King James's Works, fol. 1619.

<sup>5</sup> This ballad was first printed by Allan Ramsay in *The Evergreen*, vol. i. pp. 108-111. It has been reprinted in Lord Hailes's *Ancient Scottish Poems*, pp. 220, 221, 316 ; and by Walpole in his *Royal and Noble Authors*, vol. v. pp. 24-31.

Shortly after the coronation of King Francis the Second of France, the first husband of Mary Queen of Scots, Darnley visited the court of France, and was honourably received. He is described by Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, ambassador of Queen Elizabeth at the French court, in a letter to her, as "a young gentleman, an Englishman, or a Scottishman, who had no beard"—he was then only about fourteen years of age—and as being treated with great distinction by Francis and Mary at Chambord, where they were keeping their Christmas festival. The young stranger had long and private interviews both with the King and with the Duke of Guise. At his departure he was honoured with a gratuity of one thousand crowns. He went and returned by Dieppe.<sup>1</sup>

After the death of Francis the Second at Orleans, on 5th December 1560, young Darnley was the bearer of letters from his mother to Mary Queen of Scots, which he delivered to her at Orleans, where she remained some time after the death of her husband, and on his return he brought from Queen Mary autograph letters to his mother, written in French.<sup>2</sup> It is even affirmed by Chalmers, in his *Life of Queen Mary*, that her marriage with Darnley was agreed upon between her and Darnley's mother soon after the death of Francis the Second.

Before Mary's return to Scotland Darnley's mother communicated with Seton, Huntly, Sutherland, and other Catholic nobles, about

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton to Queen Elizabeth, in Forbes's Papers.

<sup>2</sup> Deposition of William Forbes, in Domestic Records, State Paper Office.

the marriage. Seton was favourable. He would not only spend his living but give his blood for the promotion of the scheme.<sup>1</sup> Mary had been only a few days in Scotland when the Earl of Sutherland introduced to her Arthur Lilliard, Darnley's tutor, who had been despatched by the Countess of Lennox to make a direct proposal for the marriage.

Darnley was a boy of only fifteen years, and Queen Mary's ambition at this time aspired to the Spanish throne; but, wishing to have two strings to her bow, she asked Lilliard about the "stature, age, qualities, abilities of young Darnley and of my Lady Lennox's friends in England and Scotland." She gave the young suitor's tutor no definite answer; but let him go with an impression that he had been favourably received. Mary kept this matter so close that no hint of the interview ever came to the knowledge of Knox or Randolph.<sup>2</sup> Yet so early as 30th January 1561-2, the latter, in a letter to Cecil from Edinburgh, of that date, mentions the probability that Mary would marry Darnley;<sup>3</sup> and towards the close of the year 1564 the rumour of her affection for Lord Darnley was current in the Scottish capital.<sup>4</sup>

Before Darnley could leave England for Scotland it was necessary for him to obtain permission from Queen Elizabeth, whose subject he was. As an illustration of the cupidity of statesmen in

<sup>1</sup> Articles against Lady Lennox. Domestic MSS., Elizabeth, vol. xxiii. Rolls House.

<sup>2</sup> Froude's History of England, vol. vii. pp. 369, 370.

<sup>3</sup> Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 201.



those times, it may be noted that the ministers of the English Queen attempted to extract bribes from his mother for this favour. Sir James Melville thus writes, "I had a secret charge to deal with my Lady Lennox, to endeavour to procure liberty for him [Darnley] to go to Scotland, where his father was already, under the pretext of seeing the country and conveying the Earl, his father, back again to England."<sup>1</sup> The Countess was too poor to be able to bribe Queen Elizabeth's ministers. The bribes therefore, if given, must have been supplied by Queen Mary. On the application of the Countess license was granted by Queen Elizabeth, early in the spring of the year 1564-5, for Lord Darnley to go to Scotland to join his father at Queen Mary's Court. According to Stow, he set out from London on the 3d of February. The date of his arrival at the Scottish Court has been variously stated, by Holinshed on the 9th of that month, by Knox about the 20th, and by Buchanan on the 13th. The author of the *Diurnal of Occurrents* in Scotland gives the last-mentioned date. On his arrival at Edinburgh he proceeded to Lord Seton's lodging in the Canongate, Edinburgh.<sup>2</sup> On the 16th of the month he went to Fife, whither the Queen had gone; and in the castle of Wemyss he was admitted to kiss her hand.<sup>3</sup> Thence he

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, Edin., 1735, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> The castle of Wemyss, in which Mary and Darnley first met in Scotland, was then the baronial residence of Sir John Wemyss of Wemyss, ancestor of the Earl of Wemyss. Sir John was the Queen's Lieutenant in Fife,

by a commission from Francis and Mary in 1559. The same castle, with many additions, is still inhabited by Mr. Erskine Wemyss, who represents a younger branch of the family of the Earl of Wemyss. In the front wall of Wemyss castle there is a carved head representing Queen Mary, in commemoration of her visit.

went to Dunkeld, where his father, the Earl of Lennox, was residing, but he speedily returned to Edinburgh, to wait the arrival of the Queen at Holyrood House.<sup>1</sup>

According to Sir James Melville, Queen Mary, though attracted by Darnley's personal appearance, was not inclined, or affected to be disinclined, to marry him, and he informs us that he strongly recommended to her this marriage, as a step which would promote her succession to the crown of England. "He found the Queen making her progress through Fife. Her Majesty took very well with him ; and said that he was the properest and best proportioned long man, that ever she had seen ; for he was of a high stature, long and small, even and straight. After he had haunted the court some time, he proposed marriage to her Majesty, which proposal she at first appeared to disrelish, as that same day she herself told me, and that she had refused a ring which he then offered unto her. I took occasion freely hereupon to speak in his favours, and to convince her Majesty that no marriage was more her interest than this, seeing it would render her title to the succession to the crown of England unquestionable."<sup>2</sup>

At that time, Darnley was in close friendship with Rizzio, whom he afterwards so mortally hated. Sir James adds, "I know not how he came to fall in acquaintance with Rizzio, but I found he also was his great friend at the Queen's hand, so that she took ay the longer the better liking of him, and at length determined to marry him."

Describing Darnley's personal appearance, Sir James says that

<sup>1</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. p. 472.

<sup>2</sup> Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 111.



he “ more resembled a woman than a man ; ” that “ he was handsome, beardless, and lady-faced.”<sup>1</sup>

The opinion formed of Darnley’s character by the Scottish nobility, when now they had an opportunity of meeting and conversing with him, was far from being of a favourable description. Randolph, the English ambassador at the Scottish Court, in a letter to Sir William Cecil, writes, “ Of my Lord Darnley, they [the wisest of the Scottish nobles] have this opinion, that in wisdom he doth not much differ from his father ; the honour, countenance, and entertainment that he hath had here maketh him think no little thing of himself. Some persuade him that there is no less good-will borne unto him by many of this nation, than that they think him a fit party for such a Queen. How easily a young man so borne in hand, daily in presence, well used, continually in company, either of the best or next about her, may be induced, either by himself to attempt, or by persuasions of others to imagine, I leave it to the judgment of others.” Randolph adds, “ Of this Queen’s mind hitherto towards him I am void of suspicion, but what affection may be stirred up in her, or whether she will be at any time moved that way, seeing she is a woman, and in all things desireth to have her will, I cannot say.”<sup>2</sup> Randolph was however here mistaken ; Mary’s affection towards Darnley did not fail to be observed by others, and it was not at this time that it was first awakened.

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Letter dated 20th March 1564-5; Keith’s History, p. 273.

Having decided on marrying Darnley, Queen Mary announced her intention to Queen Elizabeth,<sup>1</sup> which was within a month after his arrival in Scotland.

The Cardinal of Lorraine, whose counsel generally was not such as Mary, in her circumstances, could act wisely in following, yet rightly judged when he warned her against marrying a man who was not a match for her—who was a “gentil *hutaudeau*,” interpreted by Teulet “*un étourneau*, a light and inconsiderate young man,”<sup>2</sup> and by Cotgrave, “a cockerell, or great cocke chicke.”

Maitland of Lethington, Queen Mary’s secretary, was despatched to the English court to inform Queen Elizabeth of his Mistress’s inclination to marry Lord Darnley, and to ask the consent of the English sovereign.<sup>3</sup> Queen Elizabeth communicated Lethington’s message to her Privy Council in order that they might advise her upon it. They<sup>4</sup> were unanimously of opinion that the proposed marriage would be prejudicial to the amity between both the Queens, and to the continuance of the concord that then existed between the two kingdoms, and therefore advised Queen Elizabeth against giving her consent to the marriage, and recommended her to offer to Queen Mary a free choice of any other of the English nobility who were suitable and agreeable to both kingdoms.<sup>5</sup>

Sir Nicholas Throckmorton was appointed to return with Mait-

<sup>1</sup> Chalmers’s Life of Queen Mary, vol. iii. p. 551.

<sup>2</sup> Papiers d’Etat relatifs a l’Histoire de l’Ecosse, tom. ii. p. 42.

<sup>3</sup> He arrived at Westminster, London, 18th April 1565.

<sup>4</sup> 1st May 1565.

<sup>5</sup> Keith’s History, p. 274.

land and make known to Mary his Queen's dissatisfaction with the contemplated marriage.

Throckmorton, in terms of his instructions, dated 2d May 1565, was to express the Queen of England's dislike to the marriage of Queen Mary with Lord Darnley ; to threaten the withdrawal of her affection from Mary should that marriage take place ; to give her full liberty to choose for a husband any of the English nobility except Darnley ; to suggest a conference ; to promise the consideration of her title to the throne of England ; and to endeavour to persuade her of the advantages which would result from her marriage with the Earl of Leicester.<sup>1</sup> He was also earnestly to request her to send home the Queen of England's subjects, the Earl of Lennox and Lord Darnley.<sup>2</sup>

Throckmorton departed for Scotland on the 7th of May, and arrived at Edinburgh with Maitland of Lethington on the 13th.<sup>3</sup> Previous to his arrival Queen Mary had prevailed upon thirteen of the nobility to consent to her marriage with Darnley, and to sign a deed to that effect, the Earl of Murray refusing to sign, as he wished the Queen first to make her friends abroad privy to her intention, and especially to wait the return of Maitland, whom she had sent to the English court to ask the consent of Queen Elizabeth. Murray, besides, disliked the match, dreading that Darnley would be hostile to the Reformed religion.<sup>4</sup> He however afterwards gave his

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 209, No. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. p. 481.

<sup>3</sup> Keith's History, p. 276.

<sup>4</sup> Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 209, No. 43.

consent along with other nobles, on condition that the Reformed religion should be established in Parliament by the Queen, and the mass and superstition abolished ;<sup>1</sup> conditions with which Queen Mary would never have complied.

Meanwhile high honours and extensive landed estates were conferred on Darnley by Queen Mary. At Stirling, on 15th May 1565, he was created a knight, and also a Lord of Parliament, under the title of Lord of Ardmanach, receiving at the same time the lordship of that name, which comprehended numerous lands. He was at the same time belted by the Queen Earl of Ross, a title then in the Crown through forfeiture ; the original Earldom of that name in the family of Ross being one of the most ancient in Scotland. He then had the honour of making fourteen knights, of whom five were of the surname of Stuart.<sup>2</sup>

The title of Duke of Albany was reserved for Darnley till the celebration of the marriage, although the gossiping Randolph wrote that the new-made Earl chafed at the delay of his being created a Duke.

Throckmorton being admitted to an audience with Queen Mary at Stirling on the afternoon of the same day, delivered Queen Elizabeth's letter to her and informed her of his instructions. Queen Mary answered that she had communicated to Queen Elizabeth her intention as soon as she herself was determined, and reminded him that Queen Elizabeth had declared by Mr. Randolph that she left

<sup>1</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. pp. 480, 481.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 281.

to her the free choice of a husband, provided she did not seek a matrimonial alliance with the royal houses of France, Spain, or Austria, and she had thought that none would be more agreeable to the Queen of England than Lord Darnley, who was her subject and near kinsman.

In his despatch to Elizabeth, Throckmorton represented that the marriage of Queen Mary with Lord Darnley could be prevented only by force ; yet it would not, he adds, be celebrated for three months, during which time Mary would do all in her power to procure the English Queen's consent.<sup>1</sup>

Sir James Melville asserts not only that Queen Elizabeth sent her ambassador, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, to Scotland, to dissuade Queen Mary from marrying Darnley, but, in case her advice should not be taken, to persuade the Lords, and so many as were of the Protestant religion, to withstand the marriage until Darnley should subscribe a bond to maintain the Reformed religion, which he had ever professed in England.<sup>2</sup>

It was however very generally believed, as Buchanan and Knox assert, apparently upon good ground, that this marriage was not displeasing to Queen Elizabeth, whatever she might affect to the contrary.<sup>3</sup> Castelnau, the French agent at her Court, observes that "she never dreaded a sharper thorn in her foot than some potent foreign alliance to be made by the Queen of Scotland, whose king-

<sup>1</sup> Keith's History, pp. 276-278.

<sup>3</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. pp. 474, 481.

<sup>2</sup> Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 112.



dom lies so close upon hers as to be separated only by a fordable river, and whence she might be easily annoyed by a bad neighbour." Having been in France, he obtained the consent of the French Court to the marriage, and returning to England, he writes :—" I found the Queen of England much colder towards the Queen of Scots than formerly, complaining that she had subtracted her relation and subject, and that she was intending to marry him against her consent and approbation. And yet I am assured that these words were very far from her heart ; for she used all her efforts, and spared nothing to set this marriage agoing."<sup>1</sup>

Darnley's character and conduct were not such as to conciliate those who were opposed to his marriage with Queen Mary. Randolph, in a letter to Cecil, dated 21st May, writes that Lord Darnley offered to strike Lord Ruthven with his dagger because he brought him word that his elevation to the rank of Duke was postponed to another day.<sup>2</sup> Writing more fully on the same topic, Randolph, in a letter to Sir William Cecil, 2d July 1565, says, " As I am informed, and somewhat thereof hath appered in privat tawlke, that Darnley dothe assure hymself that the daunger is not so greate as yt is made ;<sup>3</sup> hys behavior is suche that he is runne in open contempte of all men, even of those that were hys cheif freinds. Whate shall become of hym I knowe not, but yt is greatlie to be feared that he

<sup>1</sup> Digges's *Complete Ambassador*, p. 13 ; Keith's *History*, p. 277.

<sup>2</sup> Darnley's creation to be Duke of Albany is evidently here intended. Keith's *History*, Appendix, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup> Darnley believed that the displeasure of Queen Elizabeth against his marriage with Queen Mary was affected.



cane have no longe lyfe amongste thys people. The Queen herself being of better understandinge, seekethe to frame and fashion hym to the nateur of her subjects. No perswation can alter that which custome hathe made old in hym : he is counted prowde, disdaynefull, and suspicious, which kynde of men thys sayle [soil] of anye other cane worse bear.”<sup>1</sup>

Yet Queen Mary continued to lavish her favours on Darnley. Under the designation of her well-beloved and dearest cousin, Henry Earl of Rosse, Lord of Ardmanach, he received from her a grant of a great part of the Earldom of Lennox, including numerous and extensive possessions, amongst others the lands of Kilmahew, Ardardanis, Makcawlay, Ardardane, Nobill, Lyle, Keppoch, and the islands of Inchmurrin, Inchetavannok, and Crainche, in Lochlomond, all which lie on the east side of the water of Leven, in the earldom of Lennox and shire of Dumbarton ; also the lands called the east half of the Easter Mains of Inchinnan, with the lands of Fluris, the lands called the Gardinerris lands of Inchinnan, the lands of Craigtoun, gardens and orchards of Inchinnan, which lands and islands, with the office of sheriff, formerly belonged to James Stewart of Cardonald, and had been resigned by him into the hands of the Queen, as superior thereof ; ordaining that one sasine, taken by the said Henry Earl at the island of Inchmurrin, should be a sufficient sasine for the whole lands. On a precept of sasine by Queen Mary, dated at Stirling, 25th May 1565, he was

<sup>1</sup> Keith's History, p. 287.

infested therein, 13th August following, at the island of Inchmurrin.<sup>1</sup>

It was in vain that Queen Elizabeth, in a letter to Mary Queen of Scots, wrote that she had commanded the Earl of Lennox and Lord Darnley, as her subjects, to return to England, and requested that they might receive letters of safe-conduct for passing more speedily through Scotland.<sup>2</sup>

The intended marriage of Darnley with Queen Mary was unpopular in Scotland. The people were afraid that it would result in the overthrow of the Protestant religion, and in the loss of the friendship of England. Randolph, in a letter to Leicester, 3d July 1565, while writing to this effect, adds, "Many noblemen are feared for their lives; their only expectation is from England, and care must be taken to prevent their ruin; they desire expedition and small sums of money, and a few men may be sufficient to keep life in their party. Darnley said that he cared more for the Papists in England than for the Protestants in Scotland; which shows his small love to the Queen of England in loving her enemies. He trims betwixt Popery and the Protestant religion; sometimes he comes to church. He is of an insolent, imperious temper, and thinks that he is never sufficiently honoured. The Queen does everything to oblige him, though he cannot be prevailed upon to yield the smallest thing to please her. He claims the crown matrimonial, and will

<sup>1</sup> Instrument of Sasine in the Duke of Montrose's Charter-chest.

<sup>2</sup> Letter dated 18th June 1565; Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 213, No. 70.

have it immediately. The Queen tells him that that must be delayed till he be of age, and done by consent of Parliament, which does not satisfy him.”<sup>1</sup>

Had he obtained the “crown matrimonial,” of which he was so ambitious, he would, in the event of Queen Mary’s death, have succeeded to the throne, and any daughter which he might have had by Mary, would have been passed over in favour of a son by a subsequent marriage. The Hamiltons, who were so nearly related to the royal family of Scotland, would doubtless have made the most strenuous resistance to the bestowing of the “crown matrimonial” on Darnley.

If Darnley, when simply a suitor for the Queen’s hand, exhibited towards her the imperious temper for which he is blamed by Randolph, there was little promise of harmony and happiness after marriage.

The hostility of certain of the nobles, such as the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyll and Murray, to the marriage, on Protestant grounds, was increased from a conviction that the Queen, so far from establishing, would adopt measures to overthrow the Reformed religion. These lords, in a letter to Queen Elizabeth from Stirling, 18th July 1565, represent their uncertain, if not perilous condition. They had laid before the Queen, their Sovereign, certain articles for establishing the Evangel in their native country ; but the answer having been long delayed, they had very

<sup>1</sup> Keith’s History, Appendix, p. 163.

slender hopes of success, and, afraid that their earnest suit should procure them no good-will of their own Sovereign, they had recourse to the Queen of England, as the protectress of the professors of the Reformed faith.

A civil war seemed, indeed, to be imminent. Randolph, in a letter to Secretary Cecil, dated Edinburgh, 19th July 1565, says, "All things do grow here daily worse and worse, and are like to come unto a marvellous extremity. This Queen, at this time, hath assembled all her forces, so many as she is able to make to be here in this town this day, to-morrow, and the next, to what end it is not yet known, farther than by conjecture, either to assail the Duke, the Earls of Argyll and Murray, with their complices, or to keep them present in this town until her marriage be past, which shall be openly solemnized, without fail, upon Sunday come eight days."<sup>1</sup> Randolph, in the same letter, mentions that sometimes Darnley went with the Queen to mass, and that these two last days he had been at the sermons, as if he would seem to be indifferent on the head of religion. "Your honour," he adds, "may see how her promise is kept to the Queen's Majesty, that her marriage should be deferred for three months, and nothing done therein before the Parliament, which now is prorogued to the 1st of September. These matters are thus guided by my Lord of Lennox, Lord Robert and David. Other counsell she taketh little of any subject she hath."<sup>2</sup>

On the 20th of July the Earl of Ross, Lord Darnley, was created,

<sup>1</sup> Keith's History, p. 300.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 301, 302.

by Queen Mary, Duke of Albany, and had conferred on him all the property and privileges which belonged to that Dukedom.<sup>1</sup>

Queen Mary and Lord Darnley being cousins-german, a dispensation was obtained from Rome for their marriage, without which, according to the canon law, it could not have been lawfully contracted.<sup>2</sup>

The bans of marriage between them were proclaimed in the parish church of the Canongate in the following terms:—

“The 21 of Julij, Anno Domini 1565.

“The quhilk day Johne Brand, mynister, presentit to the kirk ane writting written be the Justice Clark’s hand, desyring the kirk of the Cannongait, and mynister thair of, to proclame Harie Duk of Albaynye, erle of Roiss, etc., upon the one part, and Marie, be the grace of God, quene souerane of this realme on the vthair part. The quhilk the Kirk ordanis the mynister so to do, with inwocation of the name of God.”<sup>3</sup>

On the evening of the 28th of July, being the day before the marriage, a proclamation was made by the Queen to the effect that, in respect of her intended marriage with Darnley, who is designated Prince Henry Duke of Albany, she willed and ordained that he

<sup>1</sup> Register of the Privy Seal, xxxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Knox’s History, vol. ii. p. 495.

<sup>3</sup> Records of the Parish of Canongate, Edinburgh, MS., H. M. General Register House. In the Register of Proclamations, Kirk Session Records of the Canongate, is the following entry:—July 29, 1565. “Henry Duk of

Albany, erll of Rois, and Marie, be the g[race] of God quene souerane of this realm, 1. 2. Ma[rried] in the Chappell.” Proclamation for the third time is deleted.

In the Register of Marriages is entered, “29th day of July 1565. Henry and Marie, Kyng and Quene of Scots,” etc.



should be styled King, and that all her letters after the marriage should be directed in his and her name, as King and Queen of Scotland conjunctly.

The marriage of Darnley and Mary was celebrated in the chapel of Holyroodhouse, on Sunday, 29th July 1565, between five and six o'clock in the morning, by Mr. John Sinclair, dean of Restalrig, with great magnificence, and in the presence of the whole nobility, according to the forms of the Church of Rome, of which Mary was a devoted adherent, Darnley not having then completed his twentieth year, and the Queen being in the twenty-third year of her age. Mary was dressed in mourning, as was the fashion of widows in France on their being again married, and she did not put on gay apparel until after the marriage festival. Immediately after the ceremony she attended mass, but Darnley was not present.<sup>1</sup> During the three or four following days, as Knox says, there was nothing but balling, and dancing, and banqueting.<sup>2</sup> On the day after the marriage Darnley was, by the orders of Her Majesty, proclaimed King with sound of trumpet at the market cross of Edinburgh.<sup>3</sup>

The Earl of Lennox and Lord Darnley after this refused to

<sup>1</sup> Darnley's absence from mass could not have arisen from any religious scruple. One of the English ambassadors in Scotland, in a letter to Sir William Cecil, 25th December 1565, states that Lord Darnley was at mass, but the Queen sat up the most part of the night at cards.—Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 226, No. 103. Lord Bedford, in a letter to Cecil, 8th February 1565-6, writes

that Darnley was a zealous Papist. On Christmas Day the Queen and King carried their candles. Mass was said in many places of Scotland.—(Keith's History, Appendix, p. 167.)

<sup>2</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. p. 495.

<sup>3</sup> Keith's History, pp. 306, 307, and Appendix, p. 162.



return to England in obedience to the command of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>1</sup>

About 15th August, the Lords who were opposed to the marriage of Queen Mary and Darnley on religious grounds, including the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Argyll, Murray, Glencairn, Rothes, Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, having met at Ayr, resolved to be in readiness with their whole forces by the 24th of that month. But the Queen's forces being sooner ready, pursued them so closely from place to place that they never could draw together. At length they fled for refuge into England, expecting from Queen Elizabeth the assistance which she had promised by her ambassadors in the event of their being involved in difficulties in appearing against the late marriage, though, when reminded of her promise by the Earl of Murray, she denied that she had ever made it, and received him very coldly.<sup>2</sup>

On Sunday, 19th August, the King, "to take from the Lords of the Congregation the pretext of religion," attended divine service in St. Giles' Church, Edinburgh, where he heard a sermon preached by Knox. He sat on a throne made for the purpose. By the freedom of his utterances on that occasion Knox so incensed the King that he was summoned before the Privy Council, and on his compareance, was desired to abstain from preaching for fifteen or twenty days, his place to be supplied by Mr. Craig.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Thomas Randolph to Sir William Cecil from Edinburgh, 2d August 1565, in Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 215, No. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. pp. 496, 513; Sir James Melville's Memoirs, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. pp. 497, 498.

Subsequently to his marriage with Queen Mary, Darnley's character did not improve. Sir William Cecil, in a letter to Sir Thomas Smith, says that the young King was so insolent that his father was weary of his Government and had departed from the Court.<sup>1</sup>

In presence of many of the nobility and a gay assemblage, at Holyrood-house, Darnley was invested, on 10th February 1565-6, with the order of knighthood of St. Michael, commonly called the "Order of the Cockle," from the King of France, by Seigneur de Rembouillet, ambassador from France, who had come through England with a train of thirty-six horse, and arrived at Holyrood-house on Monday, 4th February. After the dignity was conferred, the King and Queen, with the French ambassador and a few of the Lords, went to mass. Banquets were given to the French ambassador, both at Holyrood-house and in the Castle. Rembouillet had previously conferred the same honour at Windsor on the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Leicester. He departed from Edinburgh for England on the 14th of the same month.<sup>2</sup>

Shortly after their marriage Darnley's weak, licentious, imperious, and, at the same time, suspicious character, caused a coolness between him and his wife, and frequent quarrels broke out between them. Randolph, in a letter to Sir William Cecil, writes that Darnley had demanded the crown-matrimonial with such impatience that the Queen repented that she had done so much for him.<sup>3</sup> Regardless

<sup>1</sup> Letter, dated 1st September 1565 ; Ellis's Original Letters, etc., vol. ii. p. 303.

<sup>2</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, pp. 86,

87. Knox's History, vol. ii. p. 519.

<sup>3</sup> Letter, dated 24th January 1565-6 ; Keith's History, p. 329, and Appendix, p. 166.

of what he owed to her affections, he yielded himself up to all kinds of excesses. "As for the King," says Knox, "he past his time in hunting and hawking, and such other pleasures as were agreeable to his appetite, having in his company gentlemen willing to satisfy his will and affections."<sup>1</sup> Sir William Drury, in a letter to Sir William Cecil, Berwick, 16th February 1565-6, writes, "All people say that Darnley is too much addicted to drinking. 'Tis certainly reported there was some jar betwixt the Queen and him at an entertainment in a merchant's house in Edinburgh, she only dissuading him from drinking too much himself and enticing others ; in both which, he proceeded, and gave her such words that she left the place with tears ; which they that are known to their proceedings say is not strange to be seen. These jars arise, amongst other things, from his seeking the matrimonial crown, which she will not yield unto ; which hath much displeased both him and his father. Darnley is in great misliking with the Queen. She is very weary of him, and, as some judge, will be more so ere long ; for true it is that those who depend wholly upon him are not liked of her, nor they that follow her of him, as David Rizzio and others. . . . His Government is very much blamed, for he is thought to be wilful and haughty, and some say vicious."<sup>2</sup>

Queen Mary's distaste for Darnley became hatred on his joining the conspiracy against David Rizzio, her French Secretary, of whom, though neither handsome nor well-faced, he had become jealous.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Knox's History, vol. ii. p. 514.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 329.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Herries's Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 75.

Rizzio was an Italian, a native of Savoy, born at Turin of humble parents, and came to Edinburgh in the train of the Duke of Savoy's ambassador, at the close of the year 1561. He was skilled as a musician, and soon obtained a situation as valet of the Queen's chamber. In December 1564 he was honoured with the post of her French Secretary, and acquired no inconsiderable influence in her counsels. This excited the jealousy of the Scottish nobles, whom he was at little pains to conciliate ; and, as he was believed to be an enemy of the reformed religion, he was unpopular among all who were attached to the new faith. The Earl of Bedford, in a letter to Cecil, stigmatizes him as "that great enemy of religion," and Sir James Melville represents him as a "known minion of the Pope."<sup>1</sup>

Darnley communicated his deadly intentions against Rizzio first to George Douglas, natural son of his uncle Archibald Earl of Angus.<sup>2</sup> Next, he sent George Douglas, about the 10th of February 1565-6, to Lord Ruthven, who had married a natural daughter of the Earl of Angus, Darnley's grandfather, to complain against Rizzio, and to inquire of Ruthven how he was to be revenged. Ruthven at first declined assisting him, but at last yielded, on condition that Darnley would permit the banished Lords, Murray, Glencairn, Rothes, and others to return to Scotland.

The object of Darnley was simply to get quit of Rizzio ; but

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Letter from the Earl of Bedford and Randolph to the English Council, from Berwick, 27th March 1566, narrating the circumstan-

ces of the murder of Rizzio. Robertson's History of Scotland, Appendix, No. xv. Ellis's Letters illustrative of English History, first series, vol. ii. p. 207.



Ruthven and others who joined in the plot took more comprehensive views. They wished to prevent the old religion in Scotland being restored as Queen Mary intended, as this would probably have resulted in depriving them of the ecclesiastical benefices which they possessed. The advice of envoys from France having induced her, instead of pardoning, to proceed with the utmost rigour against the banished Lords, this drove them to desperation, and the murder of Rizzio, who was Queen Mary's chief adviser, promised to be the most effective means for their restoration.

Bonds were entered into on both sides. The Lords became bound to take part with Darnley ; to give him, at the first Parliament held after their return, the crown matrimonial ; and to maintain his just title to the crown of Scotland, failing of succession by their sovereign lady.

The King became bound to obtain for the Lords remission of all crimes of whatever kind committed by them, as soon as by their assistance he obtained the crown matrimonial ; to prevent, to the utmost of his power, their being accused in Parliament and subjected to a process of forfeiture ; to secure for them, on their returning to Scotland, the enjoyment of their lands as before their flight into England ; to consent to their exercising the religion then professed ; to assist in its establishment ; and to maintain them in their just causes and quarrels against all, not excepting the Queen.

With the plot against Rizzio, Randolph, the English ambassador, became immediately acquainted, and communicated the intelli-

gence to the Earl of Leicester. At the same time he indicated that Darnley and his father projected taking the Crown from Mary, and entertained dark designs against her person, which Randolph would not dare to commit to writing. Ruthven, in his narrative of the murder of Rizzio, makes no mention of projects of this description, on which he would doubtless have frowned; but his silence—for he required to write with caution—is no evidence that they were not entertained and proposed.<sup>1</sup>

Copies of the bonds agreed to by the King and the noblemen, which Randolph had transcribed with his own hand from the originals, were sent to Queen Elizabeth, enclosed in a letter by him and the Earl of Bedford. They state that “he [Darnley] is himself determined to be at the apprehension and execution of him whom he is able manifestly to charge with the crime, and to have done him the most dishonour that can be to any man, much more being as he is. . . . The time of execution and performance of these matters is before the Parliament, as near as it is. To this determination of theirs, there are privy in Scotland these:—Argyle, Morton, Boyd, Ruthven, and Lethington. In England these:—Murray, Rothes, Grange, myself, and the writer hereof.”<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile, so impatient was the King for the death of Rizzio, that he sent a message to Lord Ruthven, to the effect that if Rizzio’s slaughter was not hastened, he would slay him with his own

<sup>1</sup> Tytler’s History of Scotland, vol. v. p. 334.

State Paper Office. Printed for the first time in Tytler’s History of Scotland, vol. v. pp.

<sup>2</sup> MS. letter dated 6th March 1565-6, in 339-341.



hand, though it were in the Queen's chamber. Ruthven counselled him against laying hands on so mean a person as a thing undignified for a king, yet fixed upon a day on which Rizzio should be put to death, though he would have preferred that the culprit should be judged by the nobility. The King would have him to be despatched in a more summary way than by a formal trial. From the Queen he kept the plot entirely hidden; and he rode with her to Seton House. In several private letters to Lord Ruthven he desired that all should be ready for the slaughter of Rizzio against his return to Edinburgh. From the unpopularity of Rizzio, Ruthven had little difficulty in finding accomplices. The services of the Earl of Morton, Lord Lindsay, and a number of barons and gentlemen having been secured, the time and place for the execution of the plot were fixed upon. The other conspirators were inclined to arrest Rizzio in his own chamber, but the King would have him to be seized while sitting with the Queen at the supper-table, that he might have an opportunity of taunting him in her presence. The others, with reluctance, yielded.

The purpose of some at least concerned in the plot was not to assassinate Rizzio, but to bring him to trial and punish him according to law. Ruthven ordered him to be taken down to the King's chamber. This was what Douglas of Lochleven, who was in the plot, contemplated; and he claims not only for himself, but for the other noblemen concerned, the credit of having abhorred assassination, and of having intended to bring Rizzio to trial. "But," says

he, "men proponit and God disponit otherways, by some extraordinary means, which truly my own heart abhorrit, when I saw him ; for I never consentit that he should be used by (beside or against) justice, neither was it in any nobleman his mind."<sup>1</sup>

Yet notwithstanding these statements by Douglas, it cannot be denied that some documents connected with the plot, the authority of which cannot be disputed, contemplated getting quit of Rizzio even by assassination, should that be necessary.

Before carrying out the plot, Morton and Ruthven, to secure themselves against treachery on the part of the King, prudently obtained from him a bond, in which he declared that what was to be done was his own device, and bound himself to keep them harmless for executing David in the Queen's presence or otherwise.<sup>2</sup> The bond is dated 1st March 1565-6.<sup>3</sup>

At seven o'clock on the evening of the 9th of March, when the Queen, who was then nearly seven months advanced in pregnancy, was in her cabinet—a room about twelve feet square, in which was a low couch or sofa and a table—sitting quietly at supper with the Countess of Argyll, the Abbot of Holyrood, Rizzio, Bethune, Laird of Creich, Arthur Erskine, and others, her domestic servants, the King, who had supped earlier than usual, went to her cabinet and placed himself beside her. At the same time the Earl of Morton and Lord Lindsay, with a body of armed men, to the number

<sup>1</sup> Lochleven Papers, in possession of the Earl of Morton, quoted in M'Crie's *Sketches of Scottish Church History*, p. 577.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's *History*, Appendix, p. 122.

<sup>3</sup> Keith's *History*, Appendix, p. 167.

of one hundred and sixty, or thereby, entered within the court before the closing of the gates, and took the keys from the porter,<sup>1</sup> holding the gates that none within might escape, and that none but their own party should enter. Lord Ruthven, who for two months before had been so sick as to be unable to leave his chamber,<sup>2</sup> followed by his accomplices, went up through the King's chamber by the privy way to the Queen's chamber, and into her cabinet, whilst the rest remained without, with drawn swords in their hands, crying, "A Douglas, A Douglas!"—the slogan or war-cry of the Douglasses. The Countess of Argyll was at one end of the table, and Rizzio at the other, his cap on his head, and wearing a nightgown of damask, furred, with a satin doublet, and a hose of russet velvet.<sup>3</sup> The King was speaking affectionately with her Majesty, with his hand about her waist.

Ruthven, entering in grim disguise, his head covered with his helmet, addressed the Queen gruffly, desiring that it would please her Majesty that Rizzio should come forth from her privy-chamber. The Queen commanded Ruthven, on pain of treason, to depart from her presence, saying that she would exhibit Rizzio before the Lords of Parliament to be punished, if in any respect he had offended. "Take the Queen, your wife and our sovereign," said Ruthven to the King, at the same time offering to take Rizzio by the arm, who, in terror for his life, took refuge behind her Majesty, who rose up,

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 128.

<sup>3</sup> The Earl of Bedford and Randolph's

<sup>2</sup> Lord Herries's Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 76. account.

and held her by the plaits of her gown, leaning back over the window, with his drawn dagger, which, however, he did not attempt to use. Arthur Erskine, the abbot of Holyrood, Lord Keith, master of the household, and the French apothecary, attempted to seize on Ruthven, none other of the King's party being at that moment present. Ruthven drew his dagger and defended himself until others of the conspirators, Patrick Murray of Tullibardine, Andrew Ker of Fawdownsyde, Patrick Bannatyne of Stainhouse, George Douglas, bastard son of the Earl of Angus, James Scott, sheriff-depute of Perth, and Henrie Yare, a revolted priest,<sup>1</sup> entered. On their entrance Ruthven sheathed his dagger, and, by the rushing in of the conspirators, the table around which the Queen and her party sat, and on which were the supper and the candles, was overturned. The Countess of Argyll, taking one of the candles in her hand, prevented the room from being quite darkened. The King loosed Rizzio's hand from the Queen's dress, and the conspirators laid hold upon him. The Queen affirmed that they struck Rizzio over her shoulders with whinzeards, some of them standing before her face with bended daggs (pistols).<sup>2</sup> In Lord Herries's Memoirs it is said that the Queen, having taken hold of Rizzio, would not relax her grasp until Andrew Ker of Fawdownsyde held a pistol to her breast, which refused to give fire, and then by violence pulled him away.<sup>3</sup> But Ruthven, in his narrative, denied the allegation of her

<sup>1</sup> Lord Herries's Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 331.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76.



Majesty that some held pistols to her breast and others made thrusts so near her that she felt the coldness of the iron, and solemnly asserted that there was not one stroke inflicted on Rizzio in her Majesty's presence, and that he was not wounded till he was taken to the farther door of her outer chamber.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile Ruthven took the Queen and put her into the King's arms, beseeching her not to be afraid, as no one there would do her the smallest personal harm, and he assured her that all that was done was by the King's order. The rest of the conspirators forcibly drew Rizzio out of her cabinet amidst his piercing shrieks and cries for mercy from the Queen: "Giustizia, Giustizia! sauve ma vie; Madame, sauve ma vie."<sup>2</sup> Lord Ruthven, following, bade them take him down to the King's chamber, and then he returned to the Queen's cabinet. It was the intention of Ruthven, Morton, and Lindsay, to have reserved Rizzio that night and next day to hang him.<sup>3</sup> But Rizzio was not taken down to the King's chamber. The press of the conspirators having hurried him to the outer chamber, he was there surrounded, and several of them who bore him deadly hatred, unable longer to restrain their fury, slew him with many wounds. George Douglas, plucking out the King's dagger, was the first to strike Rizzio, and he left the dagger sticking in his side.<sup>4</sup> Many others followed the example, inflicting, as the Queen testifies, fifty-six

<sup>1</sup> Keith's History, Appendix, p. 129. The Earl of Bedford and Randolph endeavoured to verify these statements of the Queen, but were unable to do so.

<sup>2</sup> Birrel's Diary, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> The Earl of Bedford and Randolph's account.

<sup>4</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 128.



strokes with whinzeards and swords. Thus Rizzio was not slain in the Queen's presence, according to the popular accounts of the murder. "He was forcibly drawn forth of the closet," says Sir James Melville, "and slain in the outer hall."<sup>1</sup> Immediately the Earl of Morton passed from the Queen's outer chamber to the Nether Court, to keep it and the gates; and he appointed certain barons to guard certain chambers, until he knew the pleasure of the Queen and her husband.

Meanwhile the Queen and the King came out of her cabinet to her chamber, and a warm altercation took place between them. All the while she was weeping bitterly. Lord Ruthven had risen from a sick-bed to do the sanguinary work of that night; and seized with sickness from the fatigues of the task, he prayed her Majesty to pardon him for sitting down, and asked for something to drink. A Frenchman brought him a cup of wine. After he had drunk, her Majesty spoke to him in bitter terms. Ruthven stigmatized Rizzio as "mean, basse,emie to the nobility, shame to her, and destruction to herself and country." "Well," said she, "that shall be dear blude to some of you, yf his be spylt."<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile the Earls of Huntly, Athole, and Bothwell, who had chambers within the palace, with Caithness and Sutherland, Lords Fleming, Livingston the Secretary, Tullibardine the Comptroller,

<sup>1</sup> "He was not slayne in the Queen's presens, as was said, but going down the stayres out of the chamber of presens."—The Earl of Bedford and Randolph's account.

<sup>2</sup> The Earl of Bedford and Randolph's account.

and their officers and servants, who had heard the commotion, made their appearance, and were fighting in the close against the Earl of Morton and his company. Ruthven having gone down to these lords assured them from the King that nothing was intended against them, and explained the whole proceedings of that night, how they had been planned by the King himself, as his handwriting showed, and how he had sent for the lords that were banished in England, who would be in Edinburgh on the morrow. They conversed with Ruthven on friendly terms, and do not appear to have shown any dissatisfaction with the enterprise. The Earl of Athole, the Laird of Tullibardine, Secretary Lethington, and Sir James Balfour, who were in great terror for their lives, were permitted to retire from the Palace that night.<sup>1</sup>

Bothwell and Huntly, on hearing that the banished Lords were about to return from England, though they had expressed to Ruthven their willingness to be reconciled with the Earls of Argyll and Murray, with whom they were at variance, thought it better to make their escape from the Palace, which they did by leaping over a window towards the little garden where the lions were lodged.<sup>2</sup>

Meanwhile Darnley and the Queen were talking together not very amicably in her chamber. "I have sent for the banished lords," said the King. "I am not to blame for their being so long

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 127.  
 "The erllis of Huntlie and Bothwill brak  
 down thair chamber windo, and come down be

ane coird on the baksyid thairof, and de-  
 pairtit thairfra." Diurnal of Occurrents in  
 Scotland, p. 90.

away," answered the Queen, "for I would have been content to have had them home at any time, had it not been for angering you."

The news of what was going on in the Palace—that the Queen was held captive and that Rizzio was slain—soon spread through the Canongate, and great alarm was excited. Simon Preston of Craigmillar, Provost of Edinburgh, with a great number of townsmen armed, came to the outer court of the Palace. The King, addressing them from the window, bade them return to their houses, as he and the Queen were in good health and nothing afraid—a statement, it need hardly be remarked, which was contrary to the truth. Upon this the company of citizens dispersed.<sup>1</sup> Lord Ruthven, coming up to the Queen's chamber, said that no hurt was done. Then her Majesty inquired, what had become of David? "I believe," answered Ruthven, "that he is in the King's chamber;" for he did not choose to tell her that her favourite was dead.

It was about this time that the Queen learned of Rizzio's death. One of her maids, who had been either prompted by curiosity, or sent by the Queen, to inquire about the fate of Rizzio, came running in and told that he was killed. The Queen asked her how she knew? I saw him dead, the maid answered. Then the Queen wiped her eyes and said, "No more tears! I will now think upon revenge!"<sup>2</sup>

The King took all the keys of the Palace and delivered them to the Earl of Morton.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> *Lord Herries's Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 77.

<sup>3</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 90.

He directed letters, subscribed with his own hand, charging certain officers of Edinburgh to make watch, and to suffer none except Protestants to come out of doors, under heavy penalties.

At the same time, a proclamation, subscribed by the King, was prepared, to be made at the market-cross of Edinburgh on the following day, discharging the Parliament, and commanding all the Estates and others called to that assembly to depart from Edinburgh within three hours, under the pain of forfeiture of life, lands, and goods, except such as were commanded to remain by a special order of the King. After this, the gates of the Palace being locked, and the King in bed, Lord Ruthven, by the King's orders, took charge of the lower gate and privy passage. Rizzio was now thrown down-stairs from the chamber where he was slain, and brought to the porter's lodge. Taking off the clothes of the murdered man, the porter said, "This was his destiny ; for upon this chest was his first bed when he came to this place, and now he lieth a very niggard and misknown knave." The King's dagger was sticking in Rizzio's side. The Queen had inquired at the King where his dagger was, and he had returned an evasive answer.

All the night of the murder, and the whole day after, the Queen was detained a captive within her chamber by the conspirators, none but the King and their own party being permitted to hold communication with her.

On Sunday (10th), the day after the assassination of Rizzio, about seven or eight o'clock in the evening, the Earls of Murray and



Rothcs, with their friends from England, alighted at the Abbey, and were well received by the King. They went to Murray's house to supper. The Queen sent for Murray, and on his coming to the Palace she graciously embraced and kissed him, saying, that had he been at home he would not have suffered her to be so uncourteously handled, at which he was so greatly moved that the tears ran down his cheeks.<sup>1</sup> Thence he went to the Earl of Montrose's house, where he remained all night.

The conspirators saw enough to excite the apprehension that Darnley would betray them. The Queen, indeed, on Monday, promised to Darnley that she would forgive them, and he desired them to write out a bond of security in whatever terms they chose, engaging that both her Majesty and himself would subscribe it. But they were distrustful equally of him and of the Queen.

Between four and five o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, the Earls of Morton and Murray, and Lord Ruthven, as the King had before promised, were admitted into the presence of the Queen, and she spoke to them in flattering terms. She desired them to draw up a bond of security, which she promised to subscribe.<sup>2</sup> It is said that to satisfy the Lords still more, she promised that on the morrow she would go to the Tolbooth, and there, with consent of the Parliament, make an act of remission to them all; and when promising this she drank to every one of them in particular. This promise is not mentioned in Ruthven's narrative.

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 92.



After supper, at six o'clock, when the King had descended to his chamber, the articles of security, which had been carefully considered and several times written over, were given to him to be subscribed by the Queen, as he had engaged should be done ; and in obedience to the Queen's request, he desired the Lords, as she had promised them remission, to remove the present guard, and to deliver the keys of her Palace to her servants, as her subscription of the articles of security would not be legal if done when under the least restraint.<sup>1</sup> From this desire the Lords concluded that there was a design on the part of the King and Queen to escape.

Yielding to the Queen's desire, the Lords delivered the keys of the Palace to her servants, and appointed the former guard to keep her chamber.<sup>2</sup> Then taking leave of the King, they went out of Holyrood-house to the Earl of Morton's house, where they supped. Neither the Queen nor Darnley subscribed the articles of security.

They now contemplated making their escape from the Palace, in which they were assisted by Sir William Stanley, the King's servant, and horses were provided. Shortly after midnight they took flight. The King was attended by Sir William Stanley ; the Queen rode behind Sir Arthur Erskine, then Master of the Horse ; and they were accompanied by a small mounted guard. They rode to Seton House, and receiving an escort of 200 horse from Lord Seton, proceeded to Dunbar Castle, where they were received by Simon Preston, the Laird of Craigmillar, who was captain of the fortress. The Queen

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 92.

left an order with one of her ladies for Sir James Melville, that he should earnestly endeavour to prevent the Earl of Murray from joining the other Lords. The Queen's object was to be revenged on the murderers of Rizzio. Sir James was successful in his efforts, and Murray and his friends desired him to signify to her Majesty that they had separated themselves from the perpetrators of that atrocious deed, with whom they would never again associate themselves.<sup>1</sup>

On Tuesday, 12th March, the Lords learned that the Queen and King had effected their escape. There being now little probability of their obtaining from the Queen any assurance of safety, the Lords resolved to remain in Edinburgh till they should send a nobleman to her Majesty, in order to request her promised signature to the articles for their security. On this mission they despatched Lord Semple to Dunbar. He was ungraciously received by the Queen, and detained in the fortress three days. She not only refused to subscribe the articles, but threatened vengeance on all concerned in the late conspiracy. The conspirators now judged it prudent to flee into England. The murder of Rizzio not being disapproved of by the English Government, which had been acquainted with the plot before its execution,<sup>2</sup> the Lords implicated, when now fugitives at Newcastle, in England, represented their case to the government of Queen Elizabeth, and solicited her favour. The Earl of Morton and Lord Ruthven did this in a letter to Sir William Cecil. In regard

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, pp. 130, 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Scotland*; Elizabeth, vol. i. p. 230, No. 33.

to the murder of Rizzio, they say, that in the manner of its execution they followed the King's advice, and kindled by extreme choler, did more than was deliberated. But their conscience bore them record that they acted for the good of the King and Queen, the State, and religion; and therefore they hoped that Cecil, as a godly and good minister, would move her Majesty [Elizabeth] to extend her clemency and favour towards them.<sup>1</sup> The Earl of Murray interceded with Queen Elizabeth in behalf of Lords Morton and Ruthven.<sup>2</sup>

When at Berwick, Morton and Ruthven sent to Sir William Cecil "the whole discourse of the manner of their proceedings in the slaughter of David," copies of which they intended to send also to France and Scotland. They inform him that they had no particular quarrel against Rizzio, but took part in the enterprise, on account of his extreme dealing against their brethren, and the danger of the suppression of religion by his advice and influence.<sup>3</sup>

If Murray interceded on behalf of Morton and Ruthven, Queen Mary, on the contrary, in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, from Edinburgh, 4th April, would have her to refuse to receive the ring-leaders, and to arrest the Earl of Morton.<sup>4</sup>

Ruthven died at Newcastle in the same month.<sup>5</sup> In a letter to Cecil of the 16th May, the Earl of Morton says, "Lord Ruthven

<sup>1</sup> Letter dated 27th March 1566; Calendar of State Papers, *ut supra*, vol. i. p. 231, No. 41.

<sup>2</sup> Letter of Randolph to Cecil, Berwick, 2d April 1566; Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 232, No. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Letter dated 2d April; Calendar of State Papers, vol. i. p. 232, No. 45.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 233, No. 48.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Herries's Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots, p. 78.

is departed, whose end was so godly, that all men that saw it did rejoice.”<sup>1</sup>

On the 18th of March the Queen and Darnley left Dunbar for Edinburgh, accompanied by 2000 horsemen whom Bothwell had collected for the Queen’s protection.

Sir James Melville met the Queen at Haddington, and was favourably received. At that town she subscribed pardons for the Earl of Murray and his followers. She could not refrain from expressing to Melville her sentiments regarding Darnley. “That night, in Haddington,” he writes, “she subscribed divers remissions for my Lord Murray and his dependers, lamenting unto me the King’s folly, ingratitude, and misbehaviour. . . . I excused the same the best I could, imputing it to his youth, which occasioned him easily to be led away by pernicious counsel, laying the blame upon George Douglas and other bad counsellors. . . . But I could perceive nothing from that day forth but great grudges that she entertained in her heart.” He adds, and this illustrates Darnley’s want of principle in deserting his fellow-conspirators :—“That night, in Haddington, the King inquired of me what was become of Morton, Ruthven, and the rest of that company. I told him I believed they were fled, but I knew not whither. ‘As they have brewed,’ says he, ‘so let them drink.’ It appeared to me that he was troubled he had deserted them, finding the Queen’s favour but cold.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of State Papers, *ut supra*, vol. i. p. 233, No. 57.

<sup>2</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, pp. 131, 132.



The assassination of Rizzio prevented the forfeiture of the noblemen of the Reformed religion at this time. On the 12th of the month, the day after the escape of the King and Queen to Dunbar, the returned Lords, who had been summoned to appear before the Parliament appointed to meet on that day, to hear and see themselves decerned to have forfeited their lands and goods for the crime of treason, appeared in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, at 12 o'clock noon, and finding none to accuse them or to hold the Parliament, protested that they had acted in obedience to their summons, and then retired to their lodgings. The Queen's advocate made a counter protest. The Lords prudently withdrew to Linlithgow.<sup>1</sup>

The treachery of Darnley towards his fellow-conspirators was now universally known. He solemnly declared in presence of the Queen and of the Lords of her Privy Council that he was innocent of the late conspiracy, and that he never counselled, commanded, assisted, nor approved the same ;<sup>2</sup> and he actively co-operated in the measures adopted against the other conspirators.

Patrick Bannatyne of Stainhouse, and Henrie Yare, the priest, were arrested, tried, hanged, and quartered. The rest of the actors fled to England and were outlawed ; others were executed as having been privy to the plot, and others less guilty were banished.<sup>3</sup>

The indignation of his fellow-conspirators at Darnley's treachery was intense. They accused him of having been the sole contriver

<sup>1</sup> Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, pp. 93, 94.

<sup>2</sup> Such is the statement of the Queen in her

letter to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, 2d April 1566, in Keith's History, p. 333.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Herries's Memoirs, etc., p. 78.



of the crime, and in proof of this they produced before the Queen the bonds relating to the plot, bearing his own signature, which revealed to her the whole truth. Randolph, in a letter to Cecil from Berwick, 4th April 1566, writes, "The Queen hath now seen all the covenants and bonds that passed between the King and the Lords; and now findeth that his declaration before her and the Council of his innocency of the death of David was false."<sup>1</sup> Her own husband, the principal conspirator of a murder—which might have cost her and her unborn child their lives—convicted too of being a liar to her and a traitor to his fellow-conspirators! Need we wonder that she shunned his company, and, to get quit of him, thought at one time of withdrawing to France and intrusting the government to a regency, consisting of Murray, Mar, Huntly, Athole, and Bothwell, and at another of procuring a divorce?

Darnley was now, indeed, one of the most unhappy of men. Hated by the Queen; by the Douglasses and his other kinsmen, whom he had betrayed after they had joined with him in the murder of Rizzio; by the Hamiltons, who were naturally opposed to him as being their rival for the throne; and by almost every nobleman in Scotland for his pride and arrogance,—where had he a friend? His company was avoided by those of his own rank. Randolph, who knew the temper of the Scots, foresaw that "he could have no long life among them." His pitiable condition is well described by Sir

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Lethington to Randolph, 27th April 1566, quoted in Tytler's *History of Scotland*, vol. v. p. 354.

James Melville :—" Her Majesty was now far gone with child, and went to Stirling, intending to lie-in there. Thither the King followed her, and from that to Alloa. At length she came back to the Castle of Edinburgh. It was thought that she fled from the King's company. . . . He went up and down all alone, seeing few durst bear him company. He was misliked by the Queen, and by all such as secretly favoured the late banished Lords. . . . It appeared to be fatal to him to like better of flatterers and ill company than plain speakers and good men ; which hath been the wreck of many princes, who, by frequenting good company, would have proved gallant men."<sup>1</sup>

A reconciliation took place between the Queen and Darnley previous to her confinement. Looking forward to that event with forebodings of personal danger, she yielded herself to forgiving emotions. In a will which she made towards the end of May or in the beginning of June,<sup>2</sup> there are twenty-six bequests to her husband, including a watch studded with diamonds and rubies ; a little dial, set with diamonds, rubies, pearls, and turquoises ; a Saint Michael, containing fourteen diamonds ; a chain of gold, enamelled

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 132.

<sup>2</sup> There were three copies of this will ; one which the Queen retained for herself, another sealed for those who were to be intrusted with the administration of public affairs, and a third intended for her relatives in France. All these copies, it would appear, have perished. But from a testamentary inventory of her jewels, books, etc., enumerating 253 articles, made by Lady Mary Livingston, to whom the Queen had committed the charge of her jewels, and

by Margaret Carwod, the Queen's bedchamber-maid, who had the charge of her cabinet, we learn the various bequests. The names of the persons to whom she bequeathed each article are written opposite on the margin in her own hand ; and at the end is a note, also in her own handwriting, to the effect that the bequests were to take effect only in the event of her infant dying with herself. The infant, if it survived her, was to inherit all.

in white, containing two hundred links, with two diamonds in each link ; and a diamond ring, enamelled in red, as to which she writes : —“ It was with this that I was married ; I leave it to the King who gave it me.”<sup>1</sup>

But soon after the birth of a prince, afterwards King James the Sixth, on the 19th of June, the old alienation between Darnley and the Queen returned.

Darnley suddenly withdrew from the Court, and took up his residence with his father at Glasgow.

Forlorn, friendless, and apprehensive of personal danger, he resolved on making his escape in an English vessel lying in the Forth. Remaining at Stirling after the Queen's departure, he told the French ambassador, Le Croc, that in a sort of desperation, he intended to go beyond sea. The Earl of Lennox, his father, attempted to alter his purpose, and failing, he wrote a letter to the Queen, praying her to use her influence to dissuade him. On the morning of the 29th of September 1566, Michaelmas day, the Queen received the letter, and in the evening Darnley appeared at the Palace of Holyrood. He would not enter so long as Murray, Argyll, and Maitland were in the Palace. The Queen brought him to her private apartments, where he remained with her all night. On the morning after, he was brought into the presence of the Council which then met. There were present the Protestant Lords, whom he had betrayed, after having solemnly bound himself to support them. There were

<sup>1</sup> Inventory of the Jewels, etc., of Mary Queen of Scots, pp. xxxiii., 109-124.

also present the Catholic Lords, the friends of Rizzio, Huntly, Caithness, Bothwell, Athole, and the Archbishop of St. Andrews. To all present he had done some grievous wrong. The letter of Lennox was read in presence of the Council. Mary attempted to bring the King to tell the Council what he would not impart to her when they were alone, the reason of his contemplated departure. Taking him by the hand, she besought him to declare if she had given him any occasion for this intention. If she was to blame, she would have him speak plainly and not spare her. The Lords assured him that they were ready to remedy any fault on their part on its being shown to them. Le Croc freely told him that the step he proposed to take would touch his own honour or the Queen's, for people would conclude that either she or himself, or both, were to blame. The King declared that he had no ground for forming such a purpose, though his language and demeanour were somewhat equivocal. Then looking to the Queen, he said, "Adieu, Madam, you shall not see my face for a long space," and next, turning to the Lords, he said, "Gentlemen, adieu," upon which he left the room.<sup>1</sup>

The Queen, in her letter to the Earl of Lennox (printed for the first time in the second volume of this work), dated 30th September, confirms this account. The news in his letter, she says, was very strange; she would have been content to keep it to herself if the

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Le Croc to Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, Queen Mary's ambassador in France, dated from Jedburgh, 15th October 1566, and letter from Privy Council of Scotland to the

Queen-mother of France, 8th October that year. Keith's History, pp. 345, 354. Froude's History of England, the reign of Elizabeth, vol. viii. pp. 298-301.



weight of the matter which touched her and her whole realm so nearly had not compelled her to make it known to her Council, in order to her receiving their advice.<sup>1</sup>

Four days after, the ship in which Darnley intended to embark, was ready to sail ; but by the persuasion of Le Croc, he was induced to remain in Scotland.

Shortly after, the Queen went in person to Jedburgh to hold Justice Courts for the trial and punishment of disorderly and traitorous persons on the borders ; the Earl of Bothwell, who was lieutenant in those parts, having preceded her to prepare for her appearance. From the fatigue of the journey, and from mental anxiety, she became seriously ill on her arrival at Jedburgh, and was prostrated by delirium and violent fever. The severe symptoms, however, gradually abated. But on the 25th of October she relapsed, and the symptoms became so severe that it was thought she was dying. Her French physician, however, was hopeful of her recovery, and by the help of the means employed she recovered. Meanwhile the King was at Glasgow. "The King," says Le Croc, "is at Glasgow, and has not been here. If he has got notice from any person, and has had sufficient time to come, if so inclined, it is a fault which I cannot excuse." It was not until the 28th of October that Darnley went to see her. But he left her again on the morrow. His tardiness in making his appearance or in expressing his sympathy, whether arising from the delay in the information reaching him, or not, was put down to his discredit.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* vol. ii. p. 350.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 352.



Mary might have got rid of Darnley by a divorce. The question was actually considered in November 1566 between her and the Earls of Huntly, Argyll, Bothwell, Murray, and Secretary Lethington, at Craigmillar Castle, to which she went after her return from Jedburgh. They encouraged her in the expectation that the divorce might be obtained without prejudice to her son. "Madame," said Lethington, "we are here, the principal of your Grace's nobility and Council, who shall find the means by which your Majesty shall be quit of him, without prejudice to your son, and although my Lord Murray, here present, be little less scrupulous for a Protestant than your Grace is for a Papist, I am sure he will look through his fingers thereat, and will behold our doings, saying nothing to them." But the Queen declined to give her consent.<sup>1</sup>

Bothwell, when proposing to the Laird of Ormiston to embark in the plot for the murder of Darnley, on Friday before the deed was done, referring to what took place at this time at Craigmillar Castle, said to him, in order to overcome his scruples:—"Tuishe, Ormistoun! ye need not take feir of this, for the haill Lords hes concluded the samen langsyne, in Craigmiller, all that wes ther with the Queen; and nane darr find falt with it, quhen it shall be done."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Maitland's words were, after the murder of Darnley, interpreted by the Earls of Huntly and Argyll, in their defence of Queen Mary, as pointing to his murder, and as proving the complicity of Murray and Lethington in that tragedy. Froude puts such a meaning upon them. (*History of England*, vol. viii. pp. 346, 347.) But it appears to us that

they must be understood as referring merely to the question of the divorce. Keith, with whom Murray was not a special favourite, admits that the conclusion of Huntly and Argyll "is by no means probative against Murray." (*History*, p. 365; and *Appendix*, pp. 136-138.)

<sup>2</sup> Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*, vol. i. p. 511.

That a bond for the slaughter of the King was prepared and signed by several eminent personages, has been commonly asserted. But the authority for this affirmation does not rest on the best authority, and no such bond, either in the original or in copy, is known to exist. The Laird of Ormiston, who was involved with Bothwell in the murder of the King, states in his confession that Bothwell had shown him such a bond, and told him by whom it was drawn up and signed. At Easter, after the King was killed, when all were demanding vengeance on the perpetrators, he went to Bothwell and asked him, "How does every body suspect you, and cry for vengeance on you, few or no other being spoken of, whilst you told me before the commission of the deed a very different story?" Bothwell, he says, showed him a contract subscribed in the handwriting of four or five distinguished persons, and he affirmed that the subscriptions were those of the Earls of Huntly and Argyll, Secretary Maitland, and Sir James Balfour; and alleged that many more promised to assist him if required. Then Bothwell read to him the contract, "quhilk," says Ormiston, "as I remember, conteinit thir words in effect, 'That for samikle it was thought expedient and maist profitable for the Commonwealth, be the haill nobilitie and lords undersubscrivit, that sic ane young fool and proud tirrane should not reign nor bear reull over thame; and that for diverse causes, thairfoir, that thays all had concludit that he sould be put off by ane way or uther; and quhosoevir sould take the deid in hand, or do it, they sould defend and fortifie it as thamselffis; for it sould be every ane of

their awin, recknit and halden done be themselffis.'” This writing, Bothwell told him, was devised by Sir James Balfour, and subscribed by them all a quarter of a year before the deed was done.<sup>1</sup>

If we admit that the Laird of Ormiston, when under the sentence of death, stated the truth, the veracity of Bothwell, who was not in the same solemn circumstances, may yet be doubted. The man who had so ruthlessly broken the sixth Commandment was not likely to have much scruple about breaking the ninth. If these noblemen subscribed such a bond as Bothwell says they did, would not Murray, in defending himself against the protestation of Huntly and Argyll, whilst denying that he subscribed such a document, have directly accused them of having subscribed a bond to do themselves what they accused him of having done ?

Darnley was not present at the baptism of the young Prince in the Royal Chapel in Stirling, which was solemnized on the 15th<sup>2</sup> of December according to the forms of the Roman Catholic Church, the Archbishop of St. Andrews officiating. Nor was he present at the public entertainments given on the occasion. He remained in his own room in Stirling Castle, which did not confirm the hope that he and Mary had been reconciled. Darnley's conduct in absenting himself from the baptism of the prince, which has generally been attributed to sulkiness of temper, may rather have been caused by an apprehension, produced by rumours that had reached him, that on such a public occasion an attempt might be made upon his life. His

<sup>1</sup> Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*512.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 360.

dread of personal danger he probably would not choose to avow, as his courage might thus be exposed to the risk of disparagement.

A similar explanation may be given of Darnley's conduct on other occasions, especially his threats of leaving Scotland and retiring to a foreign country. That conduct has been attributed to sullenness of disposition ; but may it not have arisen from a dread that from some secret plot or other his life was in peril from conspirators, of whose unscrupulous character he was not unaware ?

In December 1566 a pardon was granted by the Queen to the Earl of Morton and his party who were concerned in the murder of Rizzio, with the exception of George Douglas, who, having pulled out the King's dagger, had been the first to smite the victim, and Ker of Fawdownsyde, who had been specially active in the tragedy. This information the Earl of Bedford communicated to Cecil, in a letter dated, The Halyards, in Fife, 30th of that month.<sup>1</sup>

Bothwell, who had resolved to turn this pardon to his own purpose, proceeded south in the month of January to receive Morton and his friends on their way from England to Scotland. Having met with Morton in the yard of the hostelry of Whittingham, he revealed to him the plot for the murder of the King, telling him that such was the Queen's mind, because she blamed him more than Morton for Rizzio's slaughter. "Newly come from one trouble," said Morton, "I am in no haste to enter into a new. Bring me the Queen's hand for a warrant, and then I will answer you." Bothwell

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of Scots Papers, vol. i. p. 241, No. 133.



promised to produce such a warrant. But he never produced it. Afterwards, when Morton was at St. Andrews, on a visit to the Earl of Angus, the murder of the King was pressed upon him by Archibald Douglas, who came to him from Bothwell; but he pleaded the excuse that he had not received the promised warrant to that effect in the handwriting of the Queen. Morton had no share in the plot. He simply knew, and did not reveal it.<sup>1</sup>

Having gone to Glasgow to be with his father, Darnley, on the 4th of January 1566-7, became suddenly ill. His disease was said to be small-pox. Its precise nature is not distinctly known: from the manner in which he was affected the belief became general that he had been poisoned. But of this there is no evidence. He had heard that plots had been formed for his destruction, which added to the misery of his condition, and to these he referred in letters which he wrote to the Queen.

On the 21st of January the Queen took journey from Edinburgh to visit Darnley at Glasgow, and entered the latter city on the 23d.<sup>2</sup> Darnley sent Thomas Crawford of Jordanhall, a gentleman of the household of Lennox, his friend and kinsman, afterwards celebrated for his military achievements, to meet her. A reconciliation having apparently taken place between her and Darnley, she remained in Glasgow for a few days, during which she frequently visited him. The conversations between them at their interviews

<sup>1</sup> Morton's confession in Bannatyne's Memorials, Bannatyne edition, pp. 493-518.

<sup>2</sup> Keith's History, p. 364.



have been recorded by Crawford of Jordanhall, whom the King secretly informed of all that passed between them, that it might be reported to the Earl of Lennox, and who immediately committed the same to writing, word for word, as nearly as he could remember.

During her second visit to Darnley, the Queen asked him concerning his sickness. "You are the cause of it," he answered. "You ask me what I mean by the cruelty specified in my letters. It proceeds from you only, who will not accept my offers and repentance."

In these conversations the Queen proposed to take him to Edinburgh when he was in a condition to be removed; and as the air of Holyrood-house would be too damp for him, she would have him enjoy the purer air of Craigmillar, where, by using the cold baths, he would soon be well. "If you promise me, on your honour," he said, "to live with me as my wife, and not to leave me any more, I will go with you to the end of the world, and care for nothing; if not, I will stay where I am." "It shall be as you have spoken," she replied, and thereupon she gave him her hand and faith.

The Queen set out from Glasgow with the King, on the 27th of January, and they proceeded on their journey by easy stages. On that day they went to Callendar; on the 28th they travelled to Linlithgow, where they remained all that day, and on Saturday, the 1st of February, they arrived at Edinburgh.<sup>1</sup>

The design of putting Darnley in Craigmillar Castle was altered, in consequence of his aversion to be taken there. He was now

<sup>1</sup> Keith's History, p. 364; Diurnal of Occurrents.

lodged in a solitary house called the Kirk-of-Field, whilst the Queen took up her residence in Holyrood-house. The University has since been erected on the site of the house to which Darnley was brought, and which had two months previously come into the possession of Sir James Balfour, one of Bothwell's confidential friends, and was then in the actual charge of Sir James's brother, Robert Balfour. The house appears to have been of two stories, having six or seven apartments. In it were three doors. One on the north side opened from the quadrangle of the priests' manses, and led to the rooms on the ground-floor, and to the stair which conducted to the second floor. Another door opened through the city wall, on which the south gable of the house projected, and led into a cellar on the ground-floor. The third door was on the east side, and opened into a garden. It was through this door that the conspirators, who had false keys for every lock, brought the powder into the house.<sup>1</sup>

All the time that Darnley was lodged in this house the Queen came daily to converse with him.

The keys of the house, of which the Earl of Bothwell had obtained duplicates, were given to Darnley's groom, Thomas Nelson. The door of the cellar that led into the garden, which was without

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Robertson, in his *History of Queen Mary*, states that the house stood almost upon the same spot where the house belonging to the Principal of the University now stands. That statement was confirmed by another very learned Principal of the University of Edinburgh. The late Dr. John Lee, as Principal,

occupied apartments in the south-east portion of the University buildings. When sitting in one of his rooms there, and discussing the question of Darnley's murder, he said to the writer of this Memoir that they were then upon the site of the house which was occupied by the King at the time of his murder.

the walls of the city, was without lock, but it had bolts within by which it could be secured. The room which the King was to occupy was elegantly furnished, and a bed was erected for him, with new hangings of black velvet. The Queen purposed to sleep occasionally in the same house; and in the course of a few days her apartment, which was directly under that of the King, being prepared, and a bed set up, she slept there two nights, on Wednesday the 5th of the month, and on Friday the 7th.<sup>1</sup>

Darnley was now fairly in the snare—so encompassed with the toils of destruction that it was impossible for him to escape, and an appalling tragedy followed. A conspiracy was formed against his life, of which the chief conspirator was the Earl of Bothwell, who now ruled all at Court, and it was promptly carried into effect.

The murderous intentions of Bothwell against Darnley were, on various grounds, suspected by many. But Darnley's imprudence in telling everything prevented persons from disclosing to him their suspicions, lest they might be brought into trouble. After relating that "the King was brought and lodged in the Kirk-of-Field, as a place of good air, where he might best recover his health," Sir James Melville adds, "Many suspected that the Earl of Bothwell had some enterprise against him, but few durst advertise him, because he told all again to some of his own servants, who were not all honest. Yet Lord Robert Earl of Orkney told him that if he retired not hastily out of that place it would cost him his life, which he told again to

<sup>1</sup> *Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland*, p. 105.

the Queen ; and my Lord Robert denied that ever he spoke it. This advertisement moved the Earl of Bothwell to haste forward his enterprisè.”<sup>1</sup>

Bothwell's first idea was that Darnley should be killed in the fields. This was his intention when he spoke to Hepburn about the King's murder, a day or two after the bringing of the powder from Dunbar. “At that time,” says Hepburn in his depositions, “he said to me, there is a purpose devised among some of the noblemen, and me among the rest, that the King shall be slain, and that every one of us shall send two servants to the doing thereof, either on the fields, or otherwise, as he may be apprehended.”<sup>2</sup> But Bothwell suddenly changed his mind as to the method of the perpetration of the murder. Hepburn, after deponing that Bothwell next disclosed his purpose to James Ormiston of that Ilk, and John Hay, younger of Talla, adds, “So every day there was talking among them of the same purpose, until within two days before the murder, that the said Earl changed purpose of the slaying of the King on the fields, because then it would be known, and showed to them what way it might be used better by the powder.”

On Friday, 7th February, Bothwell arranged his plans for the murder of Darnley. The persons who, under his direction, executed the plot, were Nicholas Hubert, a Frenchman, called French Paris, whom he had brought from France, and who was in the service of the Queen ; George Dalglish and William Powrie, Bothwell's ser-

<sup>1</sup> Memoirs of Sir James Melville, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*498.



vants ; John Hepburn of Bolton, his kinsman ; Patrick Wilson, his tailor ; James Ormiston, laird of that Ilk ; his uncle, Robert Ormiston, and John Hay, apparent heir to the estate of Talla, in East Lothian. It is here to be noted that all these persons were closely connected with or dependent on Bothwell, whom they could not safely disoblige ; being such as he had favoured, as Hubert the Frenchman, or his servants—Dalgleish, Powrie, and Wilson, or his relative—Hepburn of Bolton, or his vassals—the Ormistons and Hay of Talla. It was intended that the deed should be done on Saturday night, the 8th of February ; but as all things were not then in readiness it was deferred till the night after.<sup>1</sup>

In order to obtain full access to the King's lodgings at the Kirk-of-Field, fourteen false keys were made for opening the locks of all the doors, which Hepburn, after the murder, cast into the quarry hole between the Abbey and Leith.<sup>2</sup>

On Sunday, 9th February, in the gloaming, Hepburn sent John Hay of Talla's man-servant for an empty powder barrel to the person from whom Hay had purchased it. The barrel was intended to be used to hold the powder after it was brought in trunks to the King's lodgings. Bothwell supped in Mr. John Balfour's house, where the Bishop of Argyll made the banquet. After supper, Bothwell, Hepburn, and Hay, went to the Laird of Ormiston's lodgings, where was

<sup>1</sup> Depositions of Hepburn of Bolton and of Hay of Talla. These men agree in stating that only Bothwell and those mentioned in the text were at the perpetration of the

murder, and that they knew of no other companies. Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*497.

<sup>2</sup> Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*499.



Robert Ormiston. Hepburn and Hay entered, while Bothwell and his servants went away.<sup>1</sup>

At ten o'clock at night, Powrie and Wilson, having gone by order to Bothwell's apartments in the palace, found there Hepburn of Bolton, who bade them carry a trunk and mail that were lying on the floor to the gate of the gardens at the back of the Kirk-of-Field. They loaded therewith two horses of Bothwell's, and conducted them as they had been instructed. In his second deposition Powrie says that the trunk and mail were carried by him and Wilson upon a grey horse that pertained to Herman, page to Lord Bothwell, at two different times. Hay of Talla in his depositions makes a like statement. John Hepburn depones that the powder was brought at two times in a trunk and mail, and that it was carried in at Blackfriars Gate.<sup>2</sup>

The powder which was used had been brought by Bothwell's orders from Dunbar, and conveyed to his lower apartment in Holyrood-house by John Hepburn of Bolton.<sup>3</sup>

Hepburn accompanied Powrie and Wilson, and at the gate they found Bothwell, Robert Ormiston, and other two, muffled in their cloaks, apparently Talla and the Laird of Ormiston, all of whom were waiting for the arrival of the gunpowder. Having put it into bags, they assisted Powrie and Wilson in carrying these in, each putting a bag upon his shoulders or under his arm, and taking it to

<sup>1</sup> Hepburn's depositions in Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*499.

<sup>2</sup> Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. pp. \*494, \*497, \*499.

<sup>3</sup> Hepburn's depositions, Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*498.

the back wall of the garden—to the postern door which led through the town wall. There the Laird of Ormiston, Hepburn, and Talla received the powder which Powrie and Wilson were carrying, not allowing them to pass farther, and they themselves dragged the bags through the cellar into Queen Mary's bedroom, Bothwell bidding them make speed with their work and have it done before the Queen, who was at that time in Darnley's room, went away. They intended to put the powder into a barrel which they had brought with them, but it was too large to be admitted by the door. They therefore conveyed the powder in bags, and emptied the contents in a heap upon the floor directly under the King's bed.<sup>1</sup> Bothwell, who had gone to the room above to join the Queen, heard them making too much noise, and he stole down-stairs to caution them. The Laird of Ormiston, Robert Ormiston and French Paris, went away, leaving Hay and Hepburn, who were to remain within the house to attend to the firing of the train, and to the execution of the whole plot.

Powrie and Wilson removed in trunks the empty boxes in which the bags of powder were contained; and on their way they saw the Queen, who had left the King, proceeding with lighted torches before her, along Blackfriars Wynd. On that day the marriage of Bastien, a valet of the Queen's chamber, with Margaret Carwood, the Queen's favourite maid, had been celebrated at the

<sup>1</sup> Powrie, Hay, and Hepburn's Depositions, Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. pp. \*493, \*497, \*499.

Palace. The Queen was present at the ceremony, and after supping at four o'clock with the Earls of Argyll, Huntly, Bothwell, and Cassillis, at a farewell banquet given by the Bishop of the Isles to the ambassador of Savoy, she rode to the Kirk-of-Field at seven o'clock, accompanied by these noblemen, and spent the evening with her husband. It was understood that she was to sleep that night in the chamber under the King's. She went up, however, to his chamber, passing the door of her own. After conversing with him for some time, it seemed to strike her all at once that she must hasten to be present at the masked ball which was to be held in the Palace in honour of the marriage of her maid-servant; and taking an affectionate leave of her husband, between ten and eleven o'clock, she departed without entering her own bedroom where the powder had been laid, and rode to Holyrood-house, attended by the noblemen who had been present with her in the residence of Darnley.

The Queen and her attendants, including Bothwell, having gone away, Hepburn of Bolton and Hay of Talla were the only conspirators that remained. Darnley was now left only with his page, Taylor, who slept in his room, and his two servants, Nelson and Edward Symonis.

Powrie and Wilson, on leaving the Kirk-of-Field with the empty trunks, made their way to Bothwell's lodgings in the Abbey, where they remained an hour or more. Bothwell, immediately on his arrival, changed his black velvet hose and doublet of satin, both trussed with silver, for another pair of black velvet hose and a coarser doublet, and muffling himself with a riding cloak, went forth ac-

accompanied by Paris, Dalgleish, Powrie, and Wilson. They were challenged by the sentinels at the Palace, "Who is that?" "Friends." "What friends?" "My Lord Bothwell's friends;" and they were allowed to pass. Coming up the Canongate to the Nether Bow Port, and finding it closed—for it was twelve o'clock at night—it was opened for them by the keeper, on their saying that they were Bothwell's friends. They endeavoured to find the Laird of Ormiston and Robert Ormiston, who were lodged in a house on the way, but were unsuccessful. Passing down a close beneath the Friar Wynd, they came to a gate at the Blackfriars, and entering by that gate reached the back wall and dyke, where Powrie and Wilson had delivered the powder. Bothwell passed over the dyke, and bidding Powrie, Wilson, and Dalgleish remain there, until he returned to them, he joined Hepburn and Hay; and about half an hour after he came to them accompanied with Hepburn and Hay, who had already lighted the train.<sup>1</sup>

It has been supposed by some that in the interval between Bothwell's departure with the Queen and his return, Hepburn and Hay had slain Darnley and his page, William Taylor. But this cannot with certainty be affirmed. Hepburn, in his confession, says, regarding the fate of Darnley, that "he knowis nat other but that, that he [Darnley] was blowin in the ayre; for he was handilit with na men's handes, as he saw; and if he was, it was with others, and

<sup>1</sup> Depositions of William Powrie and others: Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. pp. \*493, \*494, etc.

not with tham." And Hay of Talla affirmed, which shows the levity with which Bothwell could speak of the horrible tragedy, "That in Setoun, my Lord Bothwell callit on him, and sayd, 'Quhat thought you quhen thou saw him blowen in the ayre?' Quho answerit, 'Alas! my Lord, quhy speak ye that? For quhen ever I heare sic a thing, the wordes wound me to death, as they ought to do you!'"<sup>1</sup> Buchanan asserts that, besides Bothwell and his instruments, there were two distinct parties of assassins, who came by different ways to the Kirk-of-Field, and that a few entered Darnley's chamber, of which they had the keys, and while he was sleeping strangled him and his servant, who was in the same room, and carried their bodies to the place where they were afterwards found. This historian accuses the vassals of the Archbishop of St. Andrews as having, under his orders, committed the deed.<sup>2</sup> He says that on that night the Duke of Chatelherault's lodgings, which were a little to the north<sup>3</sup> of the Provost's house, and were then occupied by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, were filled with arms, and that lights were observed gleaming in the windows. The account of Moretta, the Savoyard ambassador, then at the Court of Holyrood, as given in a letter from the Pope's nuncio, resident at Paris, in a letter to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, is to the effect that Darnley, hearing the grating

<sup>1</sup> Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*500.

<sup>2</sup> History of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 321, 322; Dr. Irving's Memoirs of Buchanan, pp. 338, 339.

<sup>3</sup> On their site once stood an hospital, which was demolished by the English in 1544; and ten years later the Duke of Chatelherault built a house on the ruins.



of the false keys of the room below, and suspecting a murderous intention, started from his bed, and rushed down the stairs in his shirt and pelisse, accompanied by his favourite page, William Taylor, and had escaped over the wall into the garden, when they were laid hold upon and strangled after a desperate resistance, and their dead bodies, with such dress as they had hastily come out with, laid where they were afterwards found, under a tree in the small orchard without the garden wall.<sup>1</sup>

There is another account:—"It was spoken," says Sir James Melville, "that the King was taken forth and brought down to a stable, where a napkin was stopped in his mouth, and he therewith suffocated."<sup>2</sup> If Darnley was slain by Hay and Hepburn before the explosion, they must, from the dread of torture, have left something in the dark tragedy untold.

About two hours after midnight, Hay and Hepburn laid the train, or match, composed of lint, which was placed in a piece of wood hollowed out, the one end being put among the powder, and the other end ignited. Then locking the doors behind them, they removed to a distance. They found Bothwell, Dalgleish, Wilson, and Powrie in the garden. Bothwell asked them if they had done all things as was ordered, to which they answered in the affirmative. After they had waited about a quarter of an hour, Bothwell, impatient at the delay, asked if there was any part of the house where they could see

<sup>1</sup> Prince Labanoff's *Recueil des lettres de Marie Stuart*, quoted in Miss Strickland's *Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, vol. v. p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, p. 155.

the train, and ascertain whether it was burning. They told him that there was no part except a window, which was within the close. But whilst they were speaking these words the match took effect, and the house was blown up. All of them now hurriedly made their escape, and came to Bothwell's lodgings in the Palace. Bothwell, on coming in, immediately called for a drink, and taking off his clothes went to bed, in which he remained about half an hour, when a messenger came to the gate, knocking, and was admitted. "What is the matter?" said Bothwell to him. "The King's house," he answered, "is blown up, and I trow the King is slain!" "Fie! treason!" cried out Bothwell; and then he rose and put on his clothes. Thereafter the Earl of Huntly and many others came to him, and they went into the Queen's chamber.<sup>1</sup>

The explosion was tremendous, shaking the earth, overthrowing the building to its foundations, and awakening from sleep the whole city. The citizens crowded in haste to the spot. Nelson, the only survivor of the inmates, who, on leaving his master, had gone to bed and slept, knew nothing till he found the house falling about him. Edward Symonis was blown up. Darnley and his page, Taylor, were found forty yards away, under a tree in a small orchard, without the garden wall, with their clothes lying beside them.

The object of the conspirators was to make people believe that the house was blown up by accident, and that the corpses of the King and his servant had been blown over the wall by the force of the

<sup>1</sup> Hepburn's depositions in Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, vol. i. p. \*499.

powder.<sup>1</sup> The morning after the murder, the Earl of Bothwell said to Sir James Melville, "The strangest accident had fallen out which ever was heard of, for thunder had come out of the sky, and had burnt the King's house, and himself was found dead, lying a little distance from the house under a tree. He desired me to go up and see him, how that there was not a hurt nor a mark on all his body. But when I went up to see him, he had been taken into a chamber and kept by one Alexander Durham ; but I could not get a sight of him."<sup>2</sup> The state in which the corpses of Darnley and his servant were found, did not confirm the statement that they were blown up with the house. Their shirts were not singed, and neither their bodies nor their clothes, which lay beside them, bore any marks whatever of fire.

At five o'clock in the morning Darnley's dead body was found in the adjacent garden, with that of William Taylor, his page, and they were taken into a house in the Kirk-of-Field, where they remained till they were buried.

By this fearful tragedy great excitement was created in Scotland, England, and throughout Europe.

Universal suspicion immediately fell on Bothwell as the perpetrator of the atrocious crime ; nor did Queen Mary herself escape the suspicion of having been accessory to its commission.

On 12th February Queen Mary emitted a proclamation, offering

<sup>1</sup> Lord Herries's *Memoirs of Mary Queen of Scots*, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, p. 155.

a reward of £2000 to the person who should furnish such information as would lead to the discovery of the devisers, counsellors, or actual committers of the murder of the King.

By the command of Queen Mary, Darnley's body was disembowelled and embalmed. In the Lord Treasurer's Books, 12th February 1566-7, there is a payment to Martene Pitcanit, apothecary, of £40 for drugs, spices, and other necessities for perfuming the body of his late Majesty; and £2, 6s. for "colis, tubbis, hardis, barrellis," and other necessities, prepared for bowelling of the King's grace. These preparations having been made, Darnley's corpse was quietly interred on the 14th of February, in the sepulchre of King James the Fifth, in the south-east corner of the Chapel-Royal at Holyrood.<sup>1</sup>

Thus miserably perished, in the 21st year of his age, Henry, King of Scotland, better known in history by his original courtesy title of Lord Darnley. Born of the house of Stewart, and allied, through his mother, to the royal house of England, he was elevated by marriage to the highest dignity in Scotland. But the giddy height was too much for a youth so weak in capacity, and so vain and worthless in character. He soon became involved in factions

<sup>1</sup> Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland, p. 106. The most of Bothwell's accomplices in the murder of Darnley suffered the last penalty of the law. Hepburn, Hay, Powrie and Dalgleish were convicted of the murder, and executed at the market-cross of Edinburgh in January 1567-8. Their bodies were also quartered, and the accounts of the Lord Treasurer for that month show payments to messengers

who were despatched with portions of their bodies to be affixed at the ports of Glasgow and other towns in Scotland. Nicholas Hubert, commonly called French Paris, was executed on the 16th August 1569, as we learn from the Lord Treasurer's Books, which contain payments made for sending two of the quarters of his body to Perth and Dundee, and his head and one of his legs to St. Andrews.



with the nobles, and his brief life may be summed up in an account of his early marriage and the two successive murders, one of them instigated by him against an ignoble victim, the other his own doom. His ruthless murder of Rizzio was soon followed, as if in swift retribution, by his own not less ruthless fate. Had his lot fallen in a more civilized age, or had his talents and virtues been such as fitted him to occupy his exalted position, he might have had a happier career. Low as he had sunk in the estimation of the Queen and her subjects, the dreadful manner of his death created universal horror, and produced a wide-spread desire for vengeance on the authors of a deed so atrocious. Tragic events followed each other in rapid succession, and retribution speedily fell on Bothwell, who, having married Queen Mary only three months after the death of his victim, was compelled, at the end of another brief month, to flee from Scotland. After suffering much wretchedness for a number of years as a prisoner in Denmark, Bothwell died there in the year 1577, a raving maniac.



SEAL OF DARNLEY AS KING.















